



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 10, 2007

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2007-11800

Dear Ms. Alexander:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 289036.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for all information pertaining to road construction on Interstate Highway 10 between mile posts 867-872 on January 8, 2005. You state that much of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the Traffic Control Devices Inspection Reports are excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information consists of Traffic Control Devices Inspection Reports. The reports are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." Under section 552.022(a)(1), a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it either is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.111 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception and therefore not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See* Open Records Decision No. 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived).

However, the department also contends the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code, which provides as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 152 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

23 U.S.C. § 409. Federal courts have determined that section 409 excludes from evidence data compiled for purposes of highway and railroad crossing safety enhancement and construction for which a state receives federal funding, in order to facilitate candor in administrative evaluations of highway safety hazards and to prevent federally-required record-keeping from being used for purposes of private litigation. *See Harrison v. Burlington N. R.R.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). We agree that section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code is other law for purposes of section 552.022(a) of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also Pierce County v. Guillen*, 123 S.Ct. 720 (2003) (upholding constitutionality of section 409, relied upon by county in denying request under state's Public Disclosure Act).

You state that the submitted information was "created for the purpose of identifying and evaluating hazards on public roads." You assert that this type of inspection is used to evaluate the safety of signs, signals, barricades, pavement markings, and other traffic control devices. You also inform us that Interstate Highway 10 is part of the National Highway System under section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code, and is therefore a federal-aid highway within the meaning of section 409. Furthermore, the department states that section 409 of title 23 would protect the submitted information from discovery in civil litigation. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that the department may withhold the Traffic Control Devices Inspection Reports pursuant to section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited

from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



M. Alan Akin  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAA/mcf

Ref: ID# 289036

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Greg C. Wilkins  
Orgain Bell & Tucker, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1751  
Beaumont, Texas 77704-1751  
(w/o enclosures)